DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 627 EA 032 832

AUTHOR	Christy, W. Keith; McNeil, Larry
TITLE	Excellence in Administrator Preparation Programs: How Will We Know?
PUB DATE	2000-11-12
NOTE	17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration (Nashville, TN, November 11-13, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; College Curriculum; College Programs; *Education Courses; Education Majors; Educational Assessment; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Utilization; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Management Development; Professional Education; *Program Evaluation; Standards

ABSTRACT

Accountability for the preparation of tomorrow's teachers and administrators has come to academia with a full head of steam. Congress has declared that it is the institutions of higher education that must be accountable for increasing K-12 student achievement. As required by the 1998 Congress, colleges of education must begin annual submission and reporting of teacher candidate test data. It is anticipated that reporting of test data from programs that prepare candidates for educational administration will soon follow. The premise upon which Congress enacted the 1998 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 was the belief that good teaching is key to student achievement. The outcome expected to arise from this exercise of accountability is that of individual institutions retaining or losing teacher and administrator preparation programs. This paper explores these issues and attempts to create a report card of criteria for measuring the quality of an educational administration and supervision program. The research question presented in this paper is How will the faculty of an administration and supervision program be able to judge its internal quality against external measures of accountability? (Author)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: EXCELLENCE IN ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

ED 481 627

Excellence in Administrator Preparation Programs: How Will We Know?

W. Keith Christy
Wkchristy@ualr.edu

Larry McNeil
Lxmcneal@ualr.edu

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Keith Christy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented: Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration
November 11-13, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 032 832

Abstract

Accountability for the preparation of tomorrow's teachers and administrators has come to academia with a full head of steam. Congress has declared that it is the institutions of higher education that must be accountable for increasing K-12 student achievement. As required by the 1998 U. S. Congress through P. L. 105-244 (2000), colleges of education must begin annual submission and reporting of teacher candidate test data. These reports are to be submitted to each state department of higher education and to the public. It is anticipated that reporting of test data from programs that prepare candidates for educational administration will soon follow (Sewall, A. M., personal communication, May 11, 2000).

The premise upon which Congress enacted the 1998 Amendments to Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title II) was the belief that good teaching is key to student achievement. The Council of Chief State School Officers (Leadership for Learning in the 21st Century, 2000) reports that creating schools to meet public expectations for elementary and secondary school student performance will require a new level of leadership to provide the "inspiration, know-how, drive and endurance required to change the schools and raise student performance" (p.4).

The outcome expected to arise from this exercise of accountability is that of individual institutions retaining or losing teacher and administrator preparation programs. This paper will explore these issues and attempt to create a "report card" of criteria for measuring the quality of an educational administration and supervision program.

Introduction

Kleiner (2000) reports parents and politicians are insisting on better teaching in the nation's schools and that change is coming swiftly to schools of education. State politicians are responding to this call with legislation mandating that license holders must pass more comprehensive and rigorous licensing examinations. National politicians (1998 Amendments, 2000) are responding by requiring state departments of higher education to report student scores on the licensing examinations.

The research question raised by this proposition and presented in this paper is "How will the faculty of an administration and supervision program be able to judge its internal quality against external measures of accountability?" The definitions of internal quality (input) and external measures (output) by Garrett, Morse, and Samuel (2000) were used in this paper. Internal quality referred to attributes the students and faculty brings to the educational experience. External measures referred to the interpretation of data used to determine how well the program prepared students for success.

Harvard University, University of Wisconsin at Madison, Stanford University, Teachers College at Columbia University, Vanderbilt University, The Ohio State University, University of Texas at Austin, Pennsylvania State University, Indiana University, and University of Michigan at Ann Arbor are the top ten ranked programs for educational administration and supervision in 2000 as reported by U. S. News. What determines the quality of these programs? How can other programs measure up to the standard set at these universities? Are the evaluation criteria appropriate for use by other programs to make improvements? These and other questions have been explored in this paper and an outcome of the research has been a report card for programs of

educational administration and supervision. The answers to these issues will be explored through the concept of program evaluation.

Program Evaluation

The term "evaluation" raises the question, "How good is it?" The key question must be "Compared to what?" (Robbins, Zweizig, 1988). The Encyclopedia of Educational Administration (Dejnpzka & Kapel, 1982) defines program evaluation as, "the assessment of the value, worth, or merit of a particular educational program"

Mohr (1995) explains that program evaluation consists of three primary elements; (a) the problem, (b) the outcome of interest, and (c) the subobjectives. Mohr (1995) defined a problem as "some predicted condition that will be unsatisfactory without the intervention of the program and satisfactory, or at least more acceptable, given the program's intervention" (p. 14). For purposes of this research, the problem was to know the standards by which programs of educational administration might be judged. Mohr (1995) explains that the outcome of interest is "what the program is ostensibly meant to accomplish" (p. 13). The outcome of interest in this study was program survival. Mohr (1995) defines a subobjective as "an outcome that must be achieved before and in order that some further outcome may be achieved" (p. 31). The subobjective for this problem was the identification of the criteria against which a program of educational leadership might be judged. These subobjectives become the external measures for determining program quality.

Measures of Internal quality

One current set of criteria currently used to determine successful graduate school programs has been employed by U. S. News (Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan, 2000) to publish a ranking of graduate schools that includes programs of educational administration and supervision. The input

measures for internal quality used in this ranking system included; (a) program reputation, (b) student selectivity (c) faculty resources, and (d) research activity.

Reputation was used as an evaluative measure by Garrett, Morse, and Flanigan (2000) as experts in higher education have long recognized that a university reputation is a valid measure of academic quality. Academia has long known that a diploma from a college or university known for excellence in a particular field offers graduates a powerful edge in the competition for good jobs. Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan (2000) measured reputation of educational administration programs by sending surveys to education school deans, associate deans, and a sample of school district superintendents in districts of over 5,000 students. The respondents were asked to rate the reputation of graduate education programs from "marginal" to "distinguished." For specialty programs such as educational administration and supervision, the deans were asked to identify 10 schools with the best programs. The superintendents were asked to select the best 25 graduate schools of administration and supervision based upon experience in hiring their graduates. The reputation criterion accounted for 40 percent of the weighted measure (Education Methodology, 2000).

Mulrine suggested another factor of reputation involved the status of the faculty and the particular department. Alan Goodman, director, of career services at Catholic University, suggested perusing the Directory of American Scholars and American Men and Women of Science. "They are helpful because they not only provide biographies but also critiques of faculty" (Mulrine, p.1).

Another source of judging reputation is from students in graduate programs. "Find out whether students are enthusiastic about the program and whether they feel like they're treated as colleagues by faculty," says Jane Finkle, graduate and professional school adviser at the University

of Pennsylvania. (Mulrine, 2000, p. 1). Students can also give you a sense of a program's culture. "You'd think, wouldn't everyone want to go to a school where there's a nice collegial feeling and everyone works together? Not necessarily. You may be the sort of person who thrives in a competitive atmosphere and hates group projects" (Mulrine, p. 1).

Student selectivity in the U. S. News (Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan, 2000) ranking was measured by using student test scores (Graduate Record Examination mean verbal, analytical, and quantitative), acceptance rates, student-faculty ratio, and number of degrees granted (Education Methodology, 2000). The caliber of student that a program attracts influences academic climate and attractiveness to graduate programs by high achievers. Student grade point average remains an important criterion in determination of quality graduate school programs.

Faculty resources in the U. S. News ranking (Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan, 2000) involved determining ratios of full-time Ph.D. and master's candidates to full-time faculty. Another measure of resources used was the percent of faculty awarded Spencer Foundation-Young Faculty, Fulbright, Guggenheim, Humboldt, or American Education Research fellowships in the past two years. Also considered were the number of doctoral and master's degrees granted in the past school year and the proportion of the fall students who were Ph.D. candidates (Education Methodology, 2000).

Among the resources important to faculty and graduate students must be that of university resources available for research and publishing. Mulrine (2000) writes that Minerva Reed, director of career services at Princeton University, says that one of the complaints she hears most often from alumni enrolled in graduate schools at other institutions is that the library is insufficient.

Research Activity in the U. S. News ranking (Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan, 2000) included total research expenditures and expenditures per faculty member and the number of faculty

members engaged in research. Research expenditures referred to public and private research conducted by the school. The Research Activity category accounted for 20 percent of the weighted score (Education Methodology, 2000).

External Measures of Accountability

There are two significant bodies in most states to which programs of educational administration and supervision must comply. Those are the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the State Department of Education for purposes of granting an individual the appropriate professional license.

Kleiner (2000) reports that there are 41 states that now require some type of licensure exam. However, most states do not require a licensing exam for new principals and/or superintendents (Wargin, 2000). In a few of the states that do require testing, one common measure that will be used with increasingly greater frequency to judge program quality and candidate performance in many states is the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) or the School Superintendent Assessment (SLLA) . These assessments are outcomes of the Council of Chief State School Officers (2000) and the work of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) to create activities for improving the accreditation of programs that prepare education administrators and to measure the skills of tomorrow's school leaders.

The SLLA and SSA are products of the Educational Testing Service. The SLLA was first used in 1999 by the states of Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, and North Carolina as part of their licensure process for principals. The instrument was developed to provide a thorough, fair, and carefully validated assessment for states to use as part of the licensure process for principals. It reflects the most current research and professional judgment and experience of educators across the country, and is based on both a national job analysis study and a set of

standards for school leaders identified by the ISLLC (School Leadership Series, 2000). The SLLA has four sections that require open-ended responses. The areas of examination are: (a) Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving, (b) Analysis of Information and Decision-Making, (c) Evaluation of Actions I, and; (d) Evaluation of Actions II. Each of these sections includes case studies or short vignettes describing a school experience. The candidate responds to specific questions that may require balancing competing claims for resources, prioritizing action steps, articulating the relevant instructional issues, or discussing appropriate problem-solving strategies (Wargin, 2000).

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2000) is the accrediting agency for many programs of educational administration and supervision. The Executive Board adopted the NCATE 2000 Unit Standards on May 11, 2000. Accountability for meeting these standards will be required for all accreditation visits beginning in fall 2001. All six of the NCATE standards will influence the selection of criteria used for accountability of administrator preparation programs. Standard 1 (Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions) requires the institution to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Standard 2 (Assessment of System and Unit Evaluation) mandates that the program collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and performance. Standard 3 (Field Experiences and Clinical Practice) requires the program to work with school personnel to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Standard 4 (Diversity) requires that candidates work with a diversity of P-12 students and higher education faculty. Standard 5 (Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development) require that faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching. Standard 6 (Unit Governance and Resources) implies that the unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel,

facilities, and resources for the preparation of candidates (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2000).

Wise and Golnick (2000) report that NCATE-accredited colleges will be expected to assess themselves for the effectiveness of their programs based on candidate performance. A part of the institutional assessment system would provide comprehensive information on candidate performance to include content knowledge, how to teach content effectively, and effect on student learning.

Improving Input Measures of Program Quality

Reputation is defined as "what people think and say the character of a person or thing is; without disgrace or discredit" (World Book Dictionary, 1963). The Harris-Fombrun Reputation Quotient (2000) is used as a business tool to rate a company's rating of reputation among its competitors. The scale comprises six dimensions of reputation; five of appear to be transferable to examining reputation of a university program. The dimensions and their attributes are as follows:

- Emotional Appeal (the organization offers a good feeling, admiration and respect, and trust)
- Products and Services (the organization stands behind its products and services, is innovative, offers high quality, and a good value for the money)
- Vision and Leadership (the organization has excellent leadership and a clear vision of its future).
- Social Responsibility (the organization supports good causes and maintains high standards in the way it treats people)

Student selectivity is closely related to reputation in that students, when possible, choose graduate schools that will enhance their own marketability. As it is said "success breeds success," high achieving students choose to associate themselves with that success. As the greatest majority of students do not have the luxury of full-time studies, students tend to make a selection of

graduate school based more for region and availability than for national reputation. McCarthy (1999) reported that a 1978 study by Davis and Spuck found that the majority of master's students and two-fifths of doctoral students lived within 25 miles of the university they were attending. This selectivity factor then becomes important for programs to attract the most capable of regional candidates.

Influencing some of these student selectivity factors could be achieved only through controversial actions involving tougher admission standards, reduction of emphasis on teaching by the professorate and better preparing students for the examinations (Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan, 2000).

Standardized test scores are a common measure of selectivity for the top-ranked graduate schools. A wide range of average GRE scores was reported by Garrett, Morse, & Flanigan (2000). In comparing GRE scores of the highest ranked educational administration programs on the U. S. News: Graduate Schools, Administration/Supervision, the highest average scores seem to be by regions. Taking an average of the top four schools in each region, the reported GRE scores ranked in the following order: west (1815), central mid-west (1717), east (1708), north (1692), and south (1665). Better preparing students for entrance examinations may well be one method of raising these scores. The significant issue to be considered in taking this action would be that of confirming whether or not these scores actually contribute to graduates that will make significant changes to society and the body of knowledge.

Faculty resources are a significant area of concern for the improvement of educational leadership programs (Achilles, 1999; Misltein, 1999; McCarthy, 1999). One concern raised in many states has been the large number of programs that prepare educational administrators. By economy of scale, it is only reasonable that with several preparation programs in a state, many

institutions have a faculty body in administrator preparation of one or two members. Milstein (1999) maintains that quality preparation cannot be maintained when so few faculty are responsible for all program design and delivery activities.

The related problem of too many programs is that of a reduction in faculty availability in educational leadership (Milstein, 1999). With fewer faculty available for open positions, many programs remain understaffed. Not having the full compliment of faculty increases faculty-student ratios and decreases program quality.

Research activity, or lack thereof, has been a concern for many in the field (Achilles, 1999; Milstein, 1999; McCarthy, 1999). Achilles (1999) writes that educational leadership faculty have not fulfilled their responsibility for conducting quality research of their own field of study.

Based upon the changing demographics of the educational leadership faculty, some causes for lack of productive research may include: (a) time is not available because of the large number of students in programs with so few faculty members; (b) few faculty members in a program creating greater teaching and advising loads; (c) the "graying" of the professorate may lead to less research productivity as faculty look to retirement; (d) fewer faculty from which to choose as vacancies occur; (e) the shift from a predominantly male field in 1974, 98%, (McCarthy, 1999) to 20% female by 1994, and; (f) the growing number of faculty members who have been in the field as educational administrators. It may be too early to judge the impact of these changes on research activity, but they may become important future considerations.

In Conclusion

Accountability in education is not a new subject. Accountability for outcomes is a new subject for the field of educational administration preparation programs. As state legislatures and Congress have begun to place a significant burden on institutions of higher education for

improving the quality of teachers and administrators in the field. As greater scrutiny is given programs in higher education, the stakes of program survival become a more severe reality. It may soon come to pass that university preparation programs that do not graduate students that are able to clearly demonstrate what they know and how they can successfully do it will surely fade away. The wave of the future may well be an addition to the "publish or perish" adage to that of "produce and publish or perish."

References

1998 Amendments to Higher Education Act of 1965 (2000). [On-line]. Available: http://www.ed.gov/legislation/HEA/sec803.html

Achilles, C. M. (1999).Savory, sapid, just plain silly, or stupid? A retrospective on education administration preparation programs. Text of a talk at Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Charlotte, North Carolina, November 13-15, 1999.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2000). Leadership for learning in the 21st century (The 2000 Council Priority, p. 4). Washington, DC.

Dejnozka, E. L., & Kapel, D. E. (1982). American Educators' Encyclopedia. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Education Methodology. U. S. News. (2000). [On-line]. Available: http://www.usnews.com/ usnews.edu/beyond/gradrank/gbedmeth.htm

Garrett, G., Morse, R. J., & Flanigan, S. M. (2000). Here's a tool to help you assess programs' academic quality. [On-line]. Available: http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/gradrank/gbrank.htm

Harris-Fombrun Reputation Quotient. (2000). The Twenty Attributes of Reputation. [On-line]. Available: http:// www.harrisinteractive.com/pop_up/rq/20.asp

Kleiner, C. (2000). Change comes to teacher education. [On-line]. Available: http:// www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/grad/gbed.htm

Mohr, L. B. (1995). Impact Analysis for Program Evaluation (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mulrine, A. (2000). How to pick the right school for you. [On-line]. Available: http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/grad/gbchoose.htm

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2000). NCATE 2000 Unit Standards. Washington, DC: Author.

P. L. 105.244. 1998 Amendments to Higher Education Act of 1965 (2000). [On-line]. Available: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/News/teacherprep/sec207.html

U. S. News and World Report: Education Specialties, Administration/Supervision. (2000). [On-line]. Available:http://www:usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/gradrank/gbedusp1.htm

Wise, A. E., & Golnick, D. M. (2000). Performance-Based Accreditation for the New Millenium. [On-line]. Available: http://www.ncate.org/newsbr/nb-0200.htm

Robbins, J., & Zweizig, D. (1988). Are we there yet? Evaluating library collections, reference services programs and personnel. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Library and Information Studies.

School Leadership Series. (2000). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Wargin, D. N. (2000). ETS and Council of State School Chiefs unveil new standards-based assessment for licensing prospective principals and other new school leaders. [On-line]. Available: http://www.ccsso.org/news/pr042998.html

World Book Dictionary. (1963). Clarence L. Barnhart (ed.). Chicago: Field Enterprises Educational Corporation.

APPENDIX A

RATING YOUR PROGRAM WITH THE "BEST"

	Top Ten Education Graduate Programs in Nation	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Other Comparative Regional University
Internal Quality Criteria			
Reputation			
Rank in State-Academics	1 to 2[illegible]		
Rank in State-Superintendents	1 to 22		
Student Evaluation			
Student Selectivity			
Graduate Record Examination			
Range of Mean Analytical Score	544 - 675		
Range of Mean Cumulative Score	1560-1969		
Mean Graduate Grade Point Average			
Acceptance Rate	23%-60%		
Millers Analogy Test			
Faculty Resources			
Range of Faculty-Student Ratio, Doctotate Degree	1.7 - 9.6		
Faculty Research Fellowships			
Range of Annual Number of Master's Degrees Awarded	154-1413		
Annual Number of Doctorate Degrees Awarded	41-243		
Library			
Research Activity			
Annual Research Grants	$4.8m-$18.4m		
Research Faculty			
External Quality Criteria			
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education	**Assessment**	**Assessment**	**Assessment**
Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions			
Professional, state, and institutional standards			
Assessment of System and Unit Evaluation			
Collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and performance			
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice			
Work with school personnel			
Diversity			
P-12 students and higher education faculty			
Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development			
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching			
Unit Governance and Resources			
leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

RATING YOUR PROGRAM WITH THE "BEST"

Arkansas Department of Education	Assessment	Assessment	Assessment
Provides purpose and direction for greater student understanding and problem solving.			
Implement plans of action efficiently and effectively for greater student achievement.			
Conducive to greater student achievement.			
Gathers information from, and communicates it effectively to students, parents, staff, the community, and the media to facilitate greater student achievement.			
Clear vision and an explicitly stated philosophy in shaping a coherent curriculum and in creating an effective school			
makes systematic use of data to assess the needs and accomplishments of students and staff.			
Internship			
Portfolio			

School Leader Licensure Assessment	Assessment	Assessment	Assessment
Evaluation of Actions I and II			
What actions to take?			
Factors to consider in responding to situation?			
How to handle the situation?			
Potential consequences of of action taken?			
Evaluation of Actions I and II			
How to balance resources, prioritize actions, instruction and curriculum issues?			
Curriculum and instruction strategies to resolution?			
Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving			
Relevant data for problem solving?			
Course of action?			
Analysis of Information and Decision-Making			
Important issues of presented data?			
Other information to assess the problem?			
Where to get additional information?			
Work with staff to address issues from data?			
Present information to parents, community, etc.?			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Institute of Education Sciences (IES)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:	Excellence in Administrator Preparation Programs: How Will We Know?
Author(s):	W. Keith Christy, Ed.D.; Larry McNeal, Ph.D.
Corporate Source:	Southern Regional Council on Educational Admir
Publication Date:	November 12, 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	**Level 2A**	**Level 2B**
↑ X	↑ ☐	↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: W Keith Christy	Printed Name/Position/Title: W. Keith Christy, Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: University of Arkansas at Little Rock 2801 s. University Ave. Little Rock, AR 72204	Telephone: 501-569-3554	Fax: 501-569-3547
	E-mail Address: wkchristy@ualr.edu	Date: October 2, 2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price:	

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Document Acquisitions Department
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207